

**REMARKS**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action issued on July 19, 2005. By this response, claims 1 and 29 is amended to either achieve better protection or correct clerical error, but claim scope is not narrowed for any reasons related to patentability. Claims 2-7 are amended to change their dependencies. Claims 30-32 are newly presented. No new matter is added. Claims 8-28 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-7 and 30 are now active for examination.

**The Office Action**

The Office Action dated July 19, 2005 rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bramwell (U.S. patent No. 6,097,193). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bramwell in view of Bertness (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,505). Claim 6 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bramwell in view of Hager et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,614).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim rejections are overcome in view of the remarks presented herein.

**The Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 29 Is Traversed**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 29 were rejected as being anticipated by Bramwell. The anticipation rejection is respectfully traversed because Bramwell cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation.

Claim 1 recites:

A testing device for a vehicle system circuit, comprising:  
a system tester;

load leads connectable at respective first ends to separated points of the vehicle system circuit and connectable at respective second ends to a first set of inputs to the tester;

sense leads connectable at respective first ends to the separated points of the vehicle system circuit and connectable at respective second ends to a second set of inputs to the tester;...and

display means for displaying in real time the impedance, conductance or admittance as measured.

(emphases added).

Apparently, the first ends of the load leads and the sense leads are connectable to the **same** separated points of the vehicle system circuit. Furthermore, the testing device of claim 1 displays in real time the impedance, conductance or admittance as measured.

On the other hand, elements B, D and elements A, C of Bramwell's tester, which the Office Action alleges to be purportedly comparable to the load leads and sense leads, respectively, do not connect to the **same** separate points of the vehicle system circuit, as described in claim 1. According to Figure 1 of Bramwell, although B (one of the purported load leads) and C (one of the purported sense leads) are connected to the same point in the circuit, elements A (the other of the purported sense leads) and D (the other of the purported load leads) are connected to two different points. Therefore, the tester in Bramwell does not teach "load leads connectable at respective first ends to separated points of the vehicle system circuit and connectable at respective second ends to a first set of inputs to the tester; sense leads connectable at respective first ends to the separated points of the vehicle system circuit and connectable at respective second ends to a second set of inputs to the tester," as described in claim 1.

Moreover, the tester in claim 1 **displays** in real time the impedance, conductance or admittance as measured. In contrast, Bramwell only describes displaying CCA (Cold Crank Ampere rating). Nowhere does Bramwell describe **displaying** in real time the impedance, conductance or admittance as measured, as described in claim 1. Although the tester in

Bramwell may calculate an impedance value, the impedance value is only an intermediate product for calculating cold-cranking current. Bramwell's system does not display an impedance value, in real time, as described in claim 1.

Since Bramwell fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1, Bramwell cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation. The anticipation rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5 and 7 indirectly depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2, 5 and 7 also are patentable over Bramwell for at least the same reasons as for claim 1, as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 2, 5 and 7 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 29 recites:

In a testing device including a system tester, load leads connectable at respective first ends to separated points of the vehicle system circuit and connectable at respective second ends to a first set of inputs to the tester, sense leads connectable at respective first ends to the separated points of the vehicle system circuit and connectable at respective second ends to a second set of inputs to the tester, the leads being coupled to the points by Kelvin connections, the improvement comprising:

a pair of conductors attached at a first end to a Kelvin clamp, the pair of conductors attached at a second end to respective terminals of a terminal block, the terminals being insulated from each other, wherein the terminal block is configured for mating to a Kelvin clamp of the testing device.

Thus, an exemplary testing device according to claim 29 includes (1) a set of load leads, (2) a set of sense leads and (3) a pair of conductors attached at a first end to a Kelvin clamp, and attached at a second end to respective terminals of a terminal block. The terminals are insulated from each other, and the terminal block is configured for mating to a Kelvin clamp of the testing device.

In rejecting claim 29, the Office Action simply replicates the claim language and alleges that Bramwell teaches the claimed features in column 6, lines 56-59 and Figure 1, elements A-B, BAT of Bramwell. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The paragraph relied on by the Office Action merely describes that “kelvin connections, or clips, are used to connect measurement apparatus 20 to the resistance under test (RUT).” See col. 6, lns. 56-59 of Bramwell. Bramwell does not specifically teach that there are three sets of leads or conductors as described in claim 29.

Since Bramwell fails to teach every feature of claim 29, Bramwell cannot support a prima facie case of anticipation. Hence, claim 29 is patentable over Bramwell. Favorable reconsideration of claim 29 is respectfully requested.

**The Obviousness Rejections of Claims 3, 4 and 6 Are Overcome**

Claims 3, 4 and 6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bramwell in combination with Bertness or Hager. The obviousness rejections are respectfully traversed because the combinations of Bramwell and either Bertness or Hager cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 3, 4 and 6 indirectly depend on claim 1. As discussed earlier, Bramwell fails to teach every limitation of claim 1, the features of which are incorporated into claims 3, 4 and 6 by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3, 4 and 6 are patentable over Bramwell for at least the same reasons as for claim 1, as well as based on their own merits.

The other two documents, Bertness and Hager, were cited by the Office Action for their purported discussions of providing ac and amplifiers, or extending means. Bertness and Hager,

however, do not alleviate the deficiencies of Bramwell. Therefore, Bramwell, even if combined with either Bertness or Hager, does not disclose every limitation of claims 3, 4 and 6.

Accordingly, the alleged combinations of Bramwell and either Bertness or Hager cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness. The obviousness rejections are untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claims 3, 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 30-32 Is Patentable**

By this Response, new dependent claims 30-32 are added. Claim 30 depends on claim 1 and further describes that values of the impedance, conductance or admittance as measured at various circuit points are displayed continuously in real time. Appropriate support for claim 30 can be found in, for instance, original claim 28 and page 1, lines 25-26 and col. 7, lines 19-20 of the written description. Claims 31 and 32 depend on claim 30, and further describe additional data that is calculated or displayed by the testing device of claim 1. Appropriate support for claims 31 and 32 can be found in, for example, original claim 1, page 3, lines 4-6 and page 7, lines 18-25 of the written description.

As discussed earlier, Bramwell, the publication that the Office Action considered the closest to claim 1, fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claims 30-32 are patentable over Bramwell as well as other less relevant documents of record, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1. Furthermore, it is believed that the documents of record, even alone or in combination, fail to disclose a tester as described in claim 1, plus the features described in any of claims 30-32. Favorable consideration of claims 30-32 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusions**

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representatives listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen  
Registration No. 56,665

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 WC:apr  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: September 20, 2005**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**